

REMARKS

In an office action dated May 7, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for lack of antecedent basis of the term "user." Applicant's representative did not write the current application or current claims, and mistakenly assumed that claims 3 and 4 depended through claim 2 on claim 1. However, as pointed out by the Examiner in an office action dated June 9, 2007, the 35 U.S.C. § 112 is entirely justified, since claim 2 is independent, and does not include the term "user." The purpose of the above amendment is to introduce the phrase "a user" into claim 2 in order to address the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections of claims 3 and 4. In the office action dated June 9, 2007, claim 5 is also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, but no explanation for the rejection is given.

In Applicant's representative's opinion, all of the claims remaining in the current application are clearly allowable. Favorable consideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
Mark E. Phillips et al.  
Olympic Patent Works PLLC



Robert W. Bergstrom  
Registration No. 39,906

Olympic Patent Works PLLC  
P.O. Box 4277  
Seattle, WA 98194-0277  
206.621.1933 telephone  
206.621.5302 fax